

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Olga Bentin	Team: Squad #4	CCRB Case #: 201905095	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 05/30/2019 3:25 PM	Location of Incident: in front of 1710 Carroll Street; 71st Precinct stationhouse	Precinct: 71	18 Mo. SOL 11/30/2020	EO SOL 7/17/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 06/12/2019 2:44 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 06/12/2019 2:44 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Frank Beers	17641	945498	071 PCT
2. An officer			071 PCT
3. POM John Mcmanus	15975	949309	071 PCT
4. POM Anderson Thimote	16504	957399	071 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT Martin Cunningham	02100	946888	071 PCT
2. POM Mario Bueno	11861	960290	071 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Frank Beers	Abuse: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	§ 87(2)(g)
B.POM Frank Beers	Abuse: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers questioned § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(g)
C.POM Frank Beers	Abuse: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers searched § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(g)
D.POM Frank Beers	Abuse: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers frisked § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(g)
E.POM Anderson Thimote	Abuse: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Anderson Thimote searched § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(g)
F.POM Frank Beers	Abuse: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	§ 87(2)(g)
G.POM Frank Beers	Discourtesy: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers acted discourteously toward § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(g)
H. An officer	Abuse: At the 71st Precinct stationhouse, an officer searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.	§ 87(2)(g)
I. An officer	Abuse: At the 71st Precinct stationhouse, an officer damaged § 87(2)(b)'s property.	§ 87(2)(g)
J.POM Frank Beers	Abuse: Police Officer Frank Beers issued a summons to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(g)

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)		§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Case Summary

On June 12, 2019, § 87(2)(b) contacted the CCRB by phone and filed this complaint on his own behalf and on behalf of his friend, § 87(2)(b).

On May 30, 2019, at approximately 3:25 p.m., PO Frank Beers, PO Anderson Thimote, and Sgt. Martin Cunningham, all of the 71st Precinct, pulled § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) over in front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). PO Beers approached the vehicle and asked § 87(2)(b) whether he smoked weed and, “Do you have anything else illegal in your car?” (**Allegation B: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). PO Beers then asked § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, and they complied. PO Beers immediately placed his hand in the front left pocket of § 87(2)(b)'s overcoat (**Allegation C: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)) and frisked § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation D: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). PO Thimote searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation E: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were escorted to the rear of his vehicle. PO Beers then searched § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle (**Allegation F: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). Approximately five minutes later, PO Beers informed § 87(2)(b) that he found a “marijuana clip” in the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were handcuffed. § 87(2)(b) told PO Beers that he could not believe that he and § 87(2)(b) were arrested for a “marijuana clip.” PO Beers smirked and stuck his tongue out at § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation G: Discourtesy**, § 87(2)(g)).

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were removed to the 71st Precinct stationhouse. PO John Mcmanus, of the 71st Precinct, transported § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle to the 71st Precinct stationhouse. Approximately an hour later, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were released from the stationhouse, with C-summonses for unlawful possession of marijuana. § 87(2)(b) returned to his vehicle and saw that the plastic interior part of the rear passenger seat and rear side doors were scratched (**Allegations H and I: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). He then opened the trunk and saw that several pairs of his sneakers were all wrinkles and thrown all over the trunk (**Allegation I continued**).

PO Beers improperly summonsed § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation J: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)).

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

The investigation was provided with BWC recordings of this incident which are discussed in greater details below.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

§ 87(2)(g) PO Beers pulled § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) over for an obstructed rear license plate.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that he was driving a 2015 white BMW I-325, § 87(2)(b). The vehicle belongs to § 87(2)(b)'s girlfriend, § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were traveling down Schenectady Avenue and turned onto Carroll Street. § 87(2)(b) saw in the rear-view mirror that a gray jeep turned on its police lights. § 87(2)(b) did not pull over immediately, because he had not committed any traffic infractions and thought that the officers were trying to pass by. § 87(2)(b) slowed down to

allow the jeep to pass, but the jeep also slowed down and pulled over behind his vehicle. PO Beers, PO Thimote, and Sgt. Cunningham exited the jeep and approached § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle. PO Beers approached the front driver side. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Beers why he was pulled over. PO Beers informed § 87(2)(b) that he had a plastic cover frame around his rear license plate and that the frame covered the license plate. § 87(2)(b) acknowledged that there was a black plastic cover frame around the rear license plate of his vehicle during the incident and that it partially covered the top and bottom parts of the license plate.

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 05) was uncooperative with the investigation.

PO Beers' BWC (BR 06) begins with PO Beers, PO Anderson, and Sgt. Cunningham stopping § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle. Between 15:09:00 and 15:09:23 minutes, PO Beers approaches the front driver side of the vehicle and asks § 87(2)(b) for his driver's license and registration. § 87(2)(b) asks PO Beers why he was pulled over. PO Beers replies, "Because you have a plate cover on your car that you are not supposed to have."

A still image (BR 07) taken from Sgt. Cunningham's BWC captures the black cover frame partially covering the top and the bottom of § 87(2)(b)'s rear license plate.

PO Beers (BR 08) testified that he, PO Thimote, and Sgt. Cunningham were traveling east-bound on Carroll Street when PO Beers observed § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle with a plastic cover frame that obstructed the rear license plate. PO Beers explained that, according to NYS Traffic Laws, the rear and the front license plates must be visible at all times, and nothing can obstruct them. PO Beers decided to stop the vehicle to inquire about the observed VTL infraction. PO Beers did not remember if he discussed his observation with his partners. PO Beers signaled a car stop and § 87(2)(b) pulled over. PO Beers ultimately used his discretion and did not summons § 87(2)(b) for the obstructed rear license plate, but warned and admonished him.

Under NY CLS Veh & Tr § 402 (1) (b) (BR 09), the number plates shall be kept clean and in a condition so as to be easily readable and shall not be covered by glass or any plastic material. The courts have held that the decision to stop an automobile is reasonable where the officers have probable cause to believe that a traffic violation has occurred, regardless of their intention. People v. Robinson, 97 N.Y. 2d 341 (2001) (BR 23)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers questioned § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers searched § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers frisked § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Anderson Thimote searched § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

Allegation (G) Discourtesy: In front of 1710 Carroll Street in Brooklyn, Police Officer Frank Beers acted discourteously toward § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g) PO Beers questioned, frisked, and searched § 87(2)(b) and that that PO Thimote searched § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(g) PO Beers searched § 87(2)(b) s vehicle. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated he contested the car stop and told PO Beers that other vehicles contained the same plastic covers. PO Beers responded, "That is not the point. Do you have anything else illegal in the car?" § 87(2)(b) replied, "No." § 87(2)(b) provided his documentation to PO Beers upon his request. PO Beers then asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle and § 87(2)(b) Gannway complied. PO Thimote asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle and § 87(2)(b) also complied. PO Beers immediately placed his hand in the front left pocket of § 87(2)(b) s overcoat. § 87(2)(b) had two cell phones and keys in the front pockets of his overcoat. He did not remember if these items bulged the pockets, but suggested that it was possible. § 87(2)(b) told PO Beers, "Please, do not go into my pockets." PO Beers quickly removed his hand from the overcoat pocket, and replied, "My hands are not in your pocket." PO Beers then asked § 87(2)(b) to walk to the rear of the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) complied. § 87(2)(b) also walked to the rear of the vehicle. PO Thimote and Sgt. Cunningham asked § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) to face them and not turn around. At some point, § 87(2)(b) turned around and saw PO Beers enter the driver side of his vehicle, pick up several credit cards from the cup holder, open the center console, and retrieve § 87(2)(b) s wallet. § 87(2)(b) did not see what else PO Beers did in the vehicle, because he was asked to turn away from the vehicle.

§ 87(2)(b) added that, approximately two or three minutes later, PO Beers returned and asked § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) to return to the vehicle. Both complied. § 87(2)(b) entered his vehicle and saw that documents, which were initially in the glove compartment, were laying on the front passenger seat. § 87(2)(b) also saw that his credit cards and wallet were not in the cup holder. § 87(2)(b) looked in the rear-view mirror and saw PO Beers showing his credit cards and a red Door-Dash card to PO Thimote and Sgt. Cunningham. The officers examined the cards for several minutes. PO Beers then returned and asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, turn around, and place his hands behind his back. § 87(2)(b) complied and asked PO Beers what he was being arrested for. PO Beers did not reply. § 87(2)(b) yelled, "This guy is locking me up for no reason. He is not telling me why. He is just taking me." PO Beers then told § 87(2)(b) "There was a clip in your car...I found a clip in your car." § 87(2)(b) explained, during his CCRB interview, that a "clip" is a small piece (approximately one-inch long) of a marijuana cigarette. § 87(2)(b) told PO Beers that he was lying, and that he could not have found any marijuana in his vehicle, because § 87(2)(b) does not smoke. PO Beers told § 87(2)(b) that he was arresting him for the marijuana clip. § 87(2)(b) called PO Beers petty. PO Beers smirked and stuck his tongue out at § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) (BR 05) was uncooperative with the investigation.

PO Beers' BWC (BR06), between 15:09:25 and 15:09:34 minutes, shows PO Beers informing § 87(2)(b) that he smells an odor of marijuana coming from the car, and asks if he smoked marijuana in the car. § 87(2)(b) denies smoking marijuana. At 15:09:25 minutes, PO Beers asks § 87(2)(b) "Were you smoking weed earlier?" § 87(2)(b) replies, "No, I am going to pick up my niece now." At 15:09:34 minutes, PO Beers says to § 87(2)(b) "I am letting you know that I am smelling weed coming from your car." At 15:09:38 minutes, PO Beers asks § 87(2)(b) to step out of the vehicle and he complies. At 15:09:41 minutes, PO Beers places his right hand over § 87(2)(b) s left jacket pocket. It appears that PO Beers then places his hand in the pocket as § 87(2)(b) says, "Do not go to my pockets, please." PO Beers

replies, “I am not going to go to your pockets, alright?” It is unclear if PO Beers reaches into § 87(2)(b)'s pocket. § 87(2)(b) then walks to the rear of the vehicle. At 15:10:07 minutes, PO Beers enters § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle from the front driver side and proceeds to search. PO Beers checks underneath the front driver seat, inside the cup holder, and opens the center console and checks inside. PO Beers takes a red credit card from the center console. PO Beers then checks the side door pocket. At 15:11:32 minutes, PO Beers exits the vehicle and walks over to the front passenger side. PO Beers re-enters the vehicle and checks the side pocket of the door and under the front passenger seat. PO Beers then reaches from the front to the rear passenger seats and checks several carton boxes. PO Beers opens the center console again and shovels through papers. At 15:13:32 minutes, PO Beers concludes the vehicle search and walks to the rear of the vehicle. PO Beers asks § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) to return to the vehicle. At 15:14:07 minutes, PO Beers shows the red credit card to his partners, and they examine the card. At 15:17:17 minutes, PO Beers returns to § 87(2)(b)'s car and asks for his documents. § 87(2)(b) provides the documents. PO Beers then asks § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, turn around, and place his hands behind his back. § 87(2)(b) complies and asks PO Beers where he is taking him. PO Beers tells § 87(2)(b) that he is taking him to the 71st Precinct stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) asks PO Beers what he is arrested for. As PO Beers walks § 87(2)(b) to the police vehicle, he says, “Like you said, you do not smoke weed, and there is weed in the car.” § 87(2)(b) denies having marijuana in the vehicle.

PO Thimote's BWC (BR 10) captures the same incident with the following additional information. At 15:09:48 minutes, PO Thimote asks § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, and he complies. At 15:09:53 minutes, PO Thimote searches § 87(2)(b) pants pockets. At 15:10:24 minutes, Sgt. Cunningham tells § 87(2)(b) that his car smells like weed. § 87(2)(b) denies this. § 87(2)(b) who is now at the rear, intervenes and says, “We were smoking in the crib, bro. That's it.” § 87(2)(b) then says to PO Thimote, “We were smoking in the crib and he just picked me up.”

None of the BWC recordings capture PO Beers acting discourteously in the manner alleged by § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) PO Beers stated that the driver side window of § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle was rolled down and that he smelled a strong odor of burnt marijuana emanating from the vehicle as he approached. PO Beers asked § 87(2)(b) if he smoked marijuana in the vehicle, but did not remember § 87(2)(b)'s response. PO Beers denied specifically asking § 87(2)(b) if he had anything illegal in the vehicle. PO Beers then asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, and he complied. PO Thimote asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, and he also complied. When § 87(2)(b) exited the vehicle, PO Beers saw that his front jacket pockets were bulging. He could not describe the shape or size of the bulge. PO Beers frisked § 87(2)(b)'s front jacket pockets for safety reasons. § 87(2)(b) said something to the effect of, “Please, do not go into my pocket.” PO Beers told § 87(2)(b) that he was not going to reach into his pockets. PO Beers did not recall placing his hand into § 87(2)(b)'s pockets or searching him. PO Beers acknowledged frisking § 87(2)(b)'s waistband area. PO Beers did not know if PO Thimote searched § 87(2)(b)

PO Beers instructed § 87(2)(b) to walk to the rear of the vehicle following the frisk. PO Beers then entered and searched the interior of § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle. PO Beers first entered through the front driver side and checked under the driver seat. He then opened the center console, checked inside, and found three credit cards. One of the credit cards looked suspicious,

although PO Beers could not describe it beyond stating that its label and numbers appeared suspicious. PO Beers then walked over to the front passenger side, re-entered the vehicle, and looked under the front passenger seat. He then leaned to the rear and checked underneath the rear of the front driver and front passenger seats. PO Beers noticed a box on the rear passenger seat, and he opened it and looked inside. PO Beers then checked the front passenger side door panel and found half of a burnt marijuana cigarette. PO Beers determined that it was a marijuana cigarette, based on his marijuana-related training and experience, which consists of over 300 arrests involving marijuana. PO Beers did not find any other marijuana in the vehicle. PO Beers took the credit cards and marijuana cigarette, returned to his partners, and asked § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) to get back in their vehicle. They complied. PO Beers showed the credit cards and the marijuana cigarette to his partners. PO Beers decided to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) for unlawful possession of marijuana. He also intended to check the credit cards, via a credit card reader, to confirm whether they were legal. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were handcuffed without incident. PO Beers denied sticking his tongue out at § 87(2)(b) or acting discourteously toward him in any other way. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were brought to the 71st Precinct stationhouse and they were later released with summonses for unlawful possession of marijuana (BR 02 and BR 03).

Marijuana was vouchered in relation to this incident. The marijuana was field tested and the results returned positive (BR 11).

According to People v. Cuffie, 109 A.D. 3d 1200 (2013) (BR 12), “[it] is well established that ‘the odor of marihuana emanating from a vehicle, when detected by an officer qualified by training and experience to recognize it, is sufficient to constitute probable cause’ to search a vehicle and its occupants. *see* People v Chestnut, 43 A.D. 2d 260 (1974) (BR 13)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation (H): Abuse of Authority: At the 71st Precinct stationhouse, an officer searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.

Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: At the 71st Precinct stationhouse, an officer damaged § 87(2)(b)s property.

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(b) (BR 01) stated that after being released and picking up his vehicle from the stationhouse, he saw that the plastic interior part of the rear passenger seats and the side doors were scratched. There were no scratches before the incident. § 87(2)(b) then opened the trunk and saw that his sneakers were wrinkled and thrown all over the trunk. Before the incident, the sneakers were neatly placed on the left side of the trunk and there was a laundry bag to the right. § 87(2)(b) did not witness the search or property damage. § 87(2)(b) believed that

officers searched his vehicle after it was brought to the stationhouse and caused the above damage to the interior and his sneakers. § 87(2)(b) provided several photographs (BR 04) of the alleged damage to the sneakers, which were taken on May 31, 2019, at 11:17 p.m. § 87(2)(b) took the vehicle to an auto shop immediately after being released and had the scratches polished; therefore, he did not have any photographs of the damage done to the interior of the vehicle.

§ 87(2)(b) was uncooperative with the investigation (BR 05).

PO Mcmanus' BWC recording (BR 20), between 15:19:51 and 15:27:00 minutes, captures him driving § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle to the stationhouse. The video ends after PO Mcmanus parks and exits § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle.

PO Beers (BR 08) stated that § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle was transported to the stationhouse for safekeeping, because he could not leave it unattended at the scene. PO Beers did not remember which officer transported the vehicle. PO Beers did not know what happened to the vehicle once it was brought to the stationhouse. PO Beers decided not to vouch for § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle, because vouching property is a lengthy process, and he did not wish to keep § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) at the stationhouse longer than needed. PO Beers denied searching § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle or its trunk at the stationhouse or damaging the vehicle's interior or any of § 87(2)(b)'s personal property, including sneakers. He was never informed of such search being performed by any other officer.

§ 87(2)(g)
PO Mcmanus stated that he received a call from Sgt. Cunningham, who asked him to respond to the incident location and transport a vehicle to the stationhouse. PO Mcmanus arrived at the stationhouse and parked the vehicle at the rear parking lot. He then entered the stationhouse and handed the car keys to PO Beers. PO Mcmanus denied searching § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle or its trunk at the stationhouse and he did not see any officer doing so. PO Mcmanus denied damaging any interior part of § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle or any of his personal property. PO Mcmanus did not know why § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle was not vouchered.

The 71st Precinct Command Log (BR 22) notes that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were brought to the stationhouse by PO Beers at 3:35 p.m. for unlawful possession of marijuana. § 87(2)(b) was released at 4:40 p.m., and § 87(2)(b) was released at 4:45 p.m. It is also noted that, at 10:55 p.m., Sgt. Anthony Blum provided the Desk Sergeant with a property voucher for marijuana pertaining to this incident. The Command Log does not document § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle being impounded, vouchered or searched.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Frank Beers issued a summons to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g) PO Beers issued summonses to both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) for unlawful possession of marijuana.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) was uncooperative with the investigation (BR 05).

Based on PO Thimote's BWC (BR 10), which is discussed above, § 87(2)(b) acknowledged that he smoked marijuana in his friend's house shortly before § 87(2)(b) picked him up.

§ 87(2)(b) C-summons (BR 03), issued by PO Beers, documents the following in the factual allegation section, "At t/p/o, undersigned observed the defendant inside above vehicle in possession of a marijuana cigarette FTP. Voucher #§ 87(2)(b)." ."

The same narrative is listed in the factual allegation section of § 87(2)(b) s C-summons (BR 02).

"Possession" means to have physical possession or otherwise to exercise dominion or control over tangible property. NY CLS Penal § 10.00 (BR 27) According to NY CLS Penal § 220.25(1) (BR 24), the presence of a controlled substance in an automobile, other than a public omnibus, is presumptive evidence of knowing possession thereof by each and every person in the automobile at the time such controlled substance was found. Under NY CLS Penal § 220.00 (5) (BR 25), "controlled substance" means any substance listed in schedule I, II, III, IV or V of section thirty-three hundred six of the public health law other than marihuana, but including concentrated cannabis as defined in paragraph (a) of subdivision four of section thirty-three hundred two of such law. Also see, People v. Dan, 55 A.D.3d 1042 (3 Dept. 2008) (BR 26).

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) has been party to two CCRB complaints and has been named a victim in 11 allegations (BR 14):

§ 87(2)(b)

■ [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (BR 15).
- PO Frank Beers has been a member-of-service for 11 years and has been a subject in seven CCRB complaints and 16 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Anderson Thimote has been a member-of-service for four years and has been a subject in three CCRB complaints and 10 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(b)
- :
 - 201900850 involves allegations of abuse of authority (vehicle stop, vehicle search, § 87(2)(g)), which is pending investigation.
- PO Mcmanus has been a member-of-service for nine years and has been a subject in five CCRB complaints and five allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation.
- A FOIL request was sent to the NYC Comptroller on July 26, 2019, for any Notice of Claim filed in regard to this incident. The results of the request will be added to the case file upon receipt.
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]

Squad No.: 4

Investigator: _____

Signature _____ Print Title & Name _____ Date _____

Squad Leader: _____

Signature _____ Print Title & Name _____ Date _____

Reviewer:

Signature

Print Title & Name

Date